

Hyla reinwardtii Schlegel, 1840(?) (Amphibia, Anura) : proposed conservation

Alain DUBOIS

Laboratoire des Reptiles et Amphibiens,
Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle,
25 rue Cuvier, 75005 Paris, France

As shown elsewhere in detail (DUBOIS, 1982), the valid name under the Rules of the species now known as *Rhacophorus reinwardtii* [Schlegel, 1840(?)] is in fact *Rhacophorus moschatus* Kuhl & Van Hasselt, 1822. Accordingly, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked to use its plenary powers to protect the well-known name *reinwardtii*.

Note. — This paper was submitted on 27 May 1981 to the Secretary of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, but, despite repeated requests since then, has still not been published in this journal. The problem it raised has therefore remained unresolved, despite other mentions of it in subsequent works (DUBOIS, 1981; FROST, 1985 : 547). This paper is therefore published here as it was submitted, except that a few recent references have been incorporated.

(1) The problem of the validity of the generic name *Rhacophorus* Kuhl & Van Hasselt, 1822 and of the specific names *Rhacophorus reinwardtii* Kuhl & Van Hasselt, 1822 and *Rhacophorus moschatus* Kuhl & Van Hasselt, 1822 has been the matter of several previous discussions (see in particular : STEJNEGER, 1907, 1925 ; SMITH, 1927 ; WOLF, 1936 ; BRONGERSMA, 1942). Recently however, I have presented a new analysis of this case (DUBOIS, 1982), which solves all problems associated with it, except one, for which an action of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is necessary.

(2) As already recognized by SMITH (1927), WOLF (1936) and BRONGERSMA (1942), it is clear that the short diagnosis given by KUHLE & VAN HASSELT (1822) for their new genus *Rhacophorus* is sufficient to make this name available as of KUHLE & VAN HASSELT (1822) — and not as of SCHLEGEL (1827), as suggested by others (e.g. STEJNEGER, 1907).

(3) Some authors (e.g. WOLF, 1936 ; BRONGERSMA, 1942 ; LIEM, 1970) have suggested that the type-species of *Rhacophorus* was *Hyla reinwardtii* Schlegel, 1840(?) by subsequent designation of WOLF (1936), while others (e.g. STEJNEGER, 1907 ; NIEDEN, 1923) have considered that it was *Hyla palmata* Daudin, 1803 by subsequent monotypy in SCHLEGEL (1827). Both these interpretations are incorrect.

(4) When creating their genus *Rhacophorus*, KUHLE & VAN HASSELT (1822) associated two specific names with this generic name. The first of these names, *Rhacophorus reinwardtii*, being devoid of any description, definition, or indication, is a nomen nudum and is not available as of KUHLE & VAN HASSELT (1822). This specific name became available only with

the publication by SCHLEGEL [1840(?) : pl. 30] of a plate of drawings of a species of frogs which he named *Hyla reinwardtii*. On the other hand, the second specific name proposed by KUHLE & VAN HASSELT (1822), *Rhacophorus moschatus*, is accompanied by a very short indication (statement that this species produces a smell of musk) which, although open to some discussion as to its biological relevance (see WOLF, 1936 and BRONGERSMA, 1942), is sufficient, in the meaning of the *Code*, to make the name *moschatus* available as of KUHLE & VAN HASSELT (1822). This name being the only available specific name associated with the generic name *Rhacophorus* in the original description of this genus, *Rhacophorus moschatus* Kuhl & Van Hasselt, 1822 is the type-species of *Rhacophorus* Kuhl & Van Hasselt, 1822 by monotypy. Therefore all subsequent designations of type-species for this genus, including the ones mentioned above in (3) and the overlooked designation of *reinwardtii* made by FITZINGER (1843 : 31) are invalid.

(5) A last problem remains to be dealt with. It concerns the status of the name *moschatus*. This name has been considered by all authors until now as a *nomen nudum*, and consequently has never been used as the valid name of a species. For a long time this name was believed to have been proposed by KUHLE & VAN HASSELT (1822) for a species distinct from the one named *reinwardtii* by these authors. Several authors (e.g. VAN KAMPEN, 1923 : 254 ; AHL, 1931 : 148 ; WOLF, 1936 : 187) suggested with doubt that this species might be the same which was later called *Hyla margaritifera* by SCHLEGEL (1844 : 107) and even later *Rhacophorus javanus* by BOETTGER (1893 : 338). However, after a detailed inquiry, BRONGERSMA (1942) gave good arguments to support the idea that this name had in fact been proposed for a (probably young) specimen of the species which is now known as *Rhacophorus reinwardtii*. Therefore the names *moschatus* and *reinwardtii* appear to be synonyms. However, since the first one is available as of KUHLE & VAN HASSELT (1822) and the second one as of SCHLEGEL [1840(?)], the first one would under the Rules have to replace the second one as the valid name of the species. This would be most unfortunate both because the name *moschatus* has never been used as a valid specific name since 1822, and because the name *reinwardtii* has been universally used as the valid name of the species to which they both apply since 1822 (see e.g. DUMÉRIL & BIBRON, 1841 : 532 ; FITZINGER, 1843 : 31 ; GÜNTHER, 1859 : 82 ; BOULENGER, 1882 : 88 ; VAN KAMPEN, 1923 : 264 ; SMITH, 1927 : 213 ; AHL, 1931 : 170 ; WOLF, 1936 : 211 ; BOURRET, 1942 : 446 ; BRONGERSMA, 1942 : 342 ; LIU & HU, 1961 : 255 ; INGER, 1966 : 294 ; LIEM, 1970 : 100 ; GRANDISON, 1972 : 75 ; GORHAM, 1974 : 171 ; BERRY, 1975 : 107 ; ANONYMOUS, 1977 : 52 ; DRING, 1979 : 216 ; FROST, 1985 : 547). An action of the Commission is therefore necessary to protect the name *reinwardtii*.

(6) Accordingly, I request the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature :

(1) to use its plenary powers to rule that the specific name *reinwardtii*, as published in the combination *Hyla reinwardtii* Schlegel, 1840(?) (: pl. 30), is to be given precedence over the specific name *moschatus*, as published in the combination *Rhacophorus moschatus* Kuhl & Van Hasselt, 1822 (: 104), by any author who considers that both specific names apply to a single biological species ;

(2) to place the specific name *reinwardtii*, as published in the combination *Hyla reinwardtii* Schlegel 1840(?) (: pl. 30), on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology*, with an endorsement that it is to be given precedence over the specific name *moschatus*, as published

in the combination *Rhacophorus moschatus* Kuhl & Van Hasselt, 1822 (: 104), by any author who considers that both specific names apply to a single biological species ;

(3) to place the specific name *moschatus*, as published in the combination *Rhacophorus moschatus* Kuhl & Van Hasselt, 1822 (: 104) (type-species by monotypy of *Rhacophorus* Kuhl & Van Hasselt, 1822), on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology*, with an endorsement that any author who considers that this name and the name *reinwardtii*, as published in the combination *Hyla reinwardtii* Schlegel, 1840(?) (: pl. 30), apply to a single biological species, is to use the latter name for this species ;

(4) to place the generic name *Rhacophorus* Kuhl & Van Hasselt, 1822 (: 104), type-species, by monotypy, *Rhacophorus moschatus* Kuhl & Van Hasselt, 1822, on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.

RÉSUMÉ

Ainsi que nous l'avons démontré ailleurs en détail (DUBOIS, 1982), le nom valide, selon le *Code*, de l'espèce d'Anoures actuellement connue sous le nom de *Rhacophorus reinwardtii* [Schlegel, 1840(?)] est en fait *Rhacophorus moschatus* Kuhl & Van Hasselt, 1822. En conséquence, il est demandé à la Commission Internationale de Nomenclature Zoologique de faire usage de ses pleins pouvoirs pour protéger le nom *reinwardtii*, très connu et d'emploi universel.

LITERATURE CITED

- ANONYMOUS, 1977. - [Systematic keys to the Amphibians of China]. (In Chinese). Beijing, Kexue Chupan-panche : [i-iv] + i-v + 1-93, pl. I-XVII.
- AHL, E., 1931. - Anura III. Polypedatidae. *Das Tierreich*, 55 : i-xvi + 1-477.
- BERRY, P. Y., 1975. - *The Amphibian fauna of peninsular Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur, Tropical Press : i-x + 1-130.
- BOETTIGER, O., 1893. - Neue Reptilien und Batrachier aus West Java. *Zool. Anz.*, 16 : 334-340.
- BOULENGER, G. A., 1882. - *Catalogue of the Batrachia Salientia s. Ecaudata in the collection of the British Museum*. London, Taylor & Francis : i-xvi + 1-503, pl. I-XXX.
- BOURRET, R., 1942. - *Les Batraciens de l'Indochine*. Hanoi, Institut océanographique de l'Indochine : i-x + 1-547, 4 pl.
- BRONGERSMA, L. D., 1942. - On two *Rhacophorus* species mentioned by Kuhl & Van Hasselt. *Arch. néerl. Zool.*, 6 : 341-346.
- DRING, J. C. M., 1979. - Amphibians and Reptiles from northern Trengganu, Malaysia, with descriptions of two new geckos : *Cnemaspis* and *Cyrtodactylus*. *Bull. Brit. Mus. nat. Hist. (Zool.)*, 34 : 181-241.
- DUBOIS, A., 1981. - Liste des genres et sous-genres nominaux de Ranoidea (Amphibiens Anoures) du monde, avec identification de leurs espèces-types : conséquences nomenclaturales. *Mont. zool. ual.*, (n.s.), 15, suppl. : 225-284.
- 1982. - Le statut nomenclatural des noms génériques d'Amphibiens créés par Kuhl & Van Hasselt (1822) : *Megophrys*, *Occidozyga* et *Rhacophorus*. *Bull. Mus. natn. Hist. nat.*, (4), 4 (A) : 261-280.
- DUMERIL, A.-M.-C. & BIBRON, G., 1841. - *Erpétologie générale ou histoire naturelle complète des Reptiles*. Tome 8. Paris, Roret : i-vii + 1-792.
- FITZINGER, L., 1843. - *Systema Reptilium*. Fasc. 1. *Amblyglossae*. Vindobonae, Braumuller & Seidel : 1-106 + 1-ix.

- FROST, D.R. (ed.), 1985. – *Amphibian species of the world*. Lawrence, Allen Press & Assoc. Syst. Coll. : [i-xv] + i-v + 1-732.
- GORHAM, S.W., 1974. – *Checklist of world Amphibians up to January 1, 1970*. Saint-John, the New Brunswick Museum : 1-173.
- GRANDISON, A.G.C., 1972. – Reptiles and Amphibians of Gunong Benom with a description of a new species of *Macrocalamus*. *Bull. Brit. Mus. nat. Hist. (Zool.)*, 23 : 43-101.
- GÜNTHER, A., 1859. – *Catalogus of the Batrachia Sudentia in the collection of the British Museum*. London, Taylor & Francis, 1858 (1859) : i-xvi + 1-160, pl. I-XII.
- INGER, R.F., 1966. – The systematics and zoogeography of the Amphibia of Borneo. *Fieldiana : Zool.*, 52 : 1-402.
- KUHL, H. & VAN HASSELT, J.C., 1822. – Uittreksel uit brieven van de Heeren Kuhl en Van Hasselt, aan de Heeren C.J. Temminck, Th. Van Swinderen en W. De Haan. *Algemeene Konst- en Letter-Bode*, 7 : 99-104.
- LIEM, S.S., 1970. – The morphology, systematics, and evolution of the Old World treefrogs (Rhacophoridae and Hyperoliidae). *Fieldiana : Zool.*, 57 : i-vii + 1-145.
- LIU, C.-C. & HU, S.-C., 1961. – [The tailless Amphibians of China.] (In Chinese). Shanghai : i-xvi + 1-364, pl. I-VI + I-XXVIII.
- NIEDEN, F., 1923. – Amphibia. Anura I. Subordo Aglossa und Phaneroglossa, sectio I Arcifera. *Das Tierreich*, 46 : i-xxxii + 1-584.
- SCHLEGEL, H., 1827. – Erpetologische Nachrichten. *Ins von Oken*, 20 : 281-294.
- 1840(?). – *Abbildungen neuer oder unvollständig bekannter Amphibien*. Düsseldorf, Arnz & Comp. Atlas : pl. 21-30.
- 1844. – *Ibid.* Text : 105-141 + i-xiv.
- SMITH, M.A., 1927. – Contributions to the herpetology of the Indo-Australian region. *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.*, 1927 : 199-225, pl. I-II.
- STEJNEGER, L., 1907. – Herpetology of Japan and adjacent territory. *Bull. U. S. nat. Mus.*, 58 : i-xx + 1-577, pl. I-XXXV.
- 1925. – Chinese Amphibians and Reptiles in the United States National Museum. *Proc. U. S. nat. Mus.*, 66 (25) : 1-115.
- VAN KAMPEN, P.N., 1923. – *The Amphibia of the Indo-Australian archipelago*. Leiden, Brill : i-xii + 1-304.
- WOLF, S., 1936. – Revision der Untergattung *Rhacophorus* (ausschliesslich der Madagaskar-Formen). *Bull. Raffles Mus.*, 12 : 137-217.